

# Contact Terms, Compositeness, and Atomic Parity Violation

Ann E. Nelson

Department of Physics 1560, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-1560, USA  
anelson@phys.washington.edu

The most severe constraints on quark-lepton four-fermion contact interactions come from the agreement of atomic parity violation measurements with the Standard Model. In this letter I note that for contact interactions which arise in theories of composite quarks and leptons, other approximate global symmetries than parity can eliminate the contribution of contact terms to atomic parity violation. The most stringent tests of compositeness therefore come from the high energy collider experiments at LEP II, HERA, and the Tevatron.

Recently, there has been great interest in four-fermion contact interactions between quarks and leptons, as such terms might account for the reported excess of high  $Q^2$  events in the HERA experiments [1–7]. The 8 relevant terms are usually written in the form

$$\Delta\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i,j=L,R;q=u,d} \frac{4\pi\eta_{ij}^q}{(\Lambda_{ij}^q)^2} \bar{e}_i \gamma_\mu e_i \bar{q}_j \gamma^\mu q_j \quad (1)$$

where  $\eta_{ij}^q = \pm 1$ .

It is just possible to find such terms which can account for the HERA excess while still satisfying the constraints deduced from studies of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons}$  [8] and  $p\bar{p} \rightarrow e^+e^-X$  [9], for  $\Lambda \sim 3$  TeV [3–5].

Stronger limits on such contact terms arise from atomic parity violation (APV) measurements [10,11,?]. A contact interaction apparently shifts the nuclear weak charge  $Q_W$  by an amount

$$\Delta Q_W = -2[\Delta C_{1u}(2Z + N) + \Delta C_{1d}(2N + Z)] \quad (2)$$

where

$$\Delta C_{1q} = \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi}{G_F} \left( \frac{\eta_{RL}^q}{(\Lambda_{RL}^q)^2} - \frac{\eta_{LR}^q}{(\Lambda_{LR}^q)^2} + \frac{\eta_{RR}^q}{(\Lambda_{RR}^q)^2} - \frac{\eta_{LL}^q}{(\Lambda_{LL}^q)^2} \right). \quad (3)$$

If no cancellations in eq. 3 occur amongst the various terms, measurements of the weak charge of Cesium [13] imply  $\Lambda$ 's  $\gtrsim 10$  TeV. Thus the bounds from atomic parity violation on quark-lepton contact terms appear to be much stronger than those from any collider experiments. Several authors [4,5] have invoked a new parity conserving contact interaction in order to explain the HERA data while avoiding the APV constraint. They therefore assume that

$$\frac{\eta_{RL}^q}{(\Lambda_{RL}^q)^2} = \frac{\eta_{LR}^q}{(\Lambda_{LR}^q)^2} \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{\eta_{RR}^q}{(\Lambda_{RR}^q)^2} = \frac{\eta_{LL}^q}{(\Lambda_{LL}^q)^2}. \quad (5)$$

The theoretical motivation for imposing the restrictions of eq. 4 is unclear. An awkward feature of eq. 4 is that

SU(2) gauge symmetry makes it necessary to introduce a right handed neutrino in order to have parity invariant and gauge invariant contact terms involving leptons.

One interesting class of models which will lead to contact terms at low energies are theories of composite quarks and leptons. In such theories there are new strong confining dynamics at a scale  $\Lambda$ . Unbroken chiral global symmetries of the strong dynamics explain why the quark and lepton bound states are much lighter than  $\Lambda$  [14]. Any contact terms produced by the strong dynamics will respect its global symmetries. These chiral symmetries may be explicitly broken by small effects, *e.g.* by weak gauge interactions, however small symmetry breaking terms do not affect the conclusions of this note.

It is an easy matter to find plausible approximate global symmetries, other than parity, which will ensure cancellations in eq. 3 [15]. For instance consider an approximate global SU(12) acting on all left handed first generation quark states. The left chiral fields

$$(u_L, d_L, u_L^c, d_L^c) \quad (6)$$

transform as a 12-plet  $\psi_L$ .

Assuming that the new strong dynamics respects such a symmetry, it could generate only an SU(12) singlet combination of the operators in eq. 1, which can be written in the form

$$\sum_{i=L,R} \frac{4\pi\eta_i}{(\Lambda_i)^2} \bar{e}_i \gamma_\mu e_i \bar{\psi}_L \gamma^\mu \psi_L \quad (7)$$

$$= \sum_{i=L,R;q=u,d} \frac{4\pi\eta_i}{(\Lambda_i)^2} \bar{e}_i \gamma_\mu e_i (\bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu q_L - \bar{q}_R \gamma^\mu q_R). \quad (8)$$

Thus the SU(12) symmetry guarantees that

$$\frac{\eta_{iL}^q}{(\Lambda_{iL}^q)^2} = -\frac{\eta_{iR}^q}{(\Lambda_{iR}^q)^2}, \quad (9)$$

and so there is a cancellation in the contribution to  $Q_W$ .

The SU(12) symmetry still allows for a non zero contribution to the parity violating weak coefficient  $C_{2q}$  [16], however the experimental constraints on this term are

less severe. In any case, an  $SU(3)$  symmetry acting on all the left handed first generation leptons

$$(\nu_L^e, e_L, e_L^c) \quad (10)$$

would eliminate this contribution as well.

Much stronger constraints on contact terms can be obtained by considering flavor changing neutral current decays and muon number violation. However such constraints can be satisfied by contact terms which respect a horizontal flavor symmetry, such as an  $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ , where one  $SU(2)$  acts on the first two quark generations and the other on the first two lepton generations.

In summary, I have shown that composite models of quarks and leptons could contain approximate global symmetries, other than parity, which would prevent four fermion contact terms from contributing to atomic parity violation. It would be interesting to reanalyze the effects of contact terms on physics at the various colliders, assuming the relations of eq. 9 are satisfied. With  $SU(2)$  gauge invariance

$$\frac{\eta_{iL}^u}{(\Lambda_{iL}^u)^2} = \frac{\eta_{iL}^d}{(\Lambda_{iL}^d)^2} \quad (11)$$

(neglecting quark CKM mixing) and so only two independent contact terms need be considered.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the DOE under grant #DE-FG03-96ER40956.

- [14] G. 't Hooft, 1979 Cargese Lectures, in *Recent Developments in Gauge Theories*, (New York, Plenum, 1980)
- [15] An  $SU(36)$  symmetry which suppressed quark flavor violation and APV was considered in R.S. Chivukula and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. **B326** (1989) 1
- [16] See the *Review of Particle Physics*, Phys. Rev. **D54**, pp. 85-93 for definitions of  $C_{iq}$

- 
- [1] H1 Collaboration, DESY-97-024, hep-ex/9702012
  - [2] Zeus collaboration, DESY-97-25, hep-ex/9702015
  - [3] G. Altarelli et al., CERN-TH/97-40, hep-ph/9703276
  - [4] K. S. Babu, C. Kolda, J. March-Russell and Frank Wilczek, IASSNS-HEP-97-04, hep-ph/9703299
  - [5] V. Barger et al., MadPH-97-991, hep-ph/9703311
  - [6] J. Kalinowski, R. Ruckl, H. Spiesberger and P.M.Zerwas, BI-TP-97/07, hep-ph/9703288
  - [7] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia and S.F. Novaes, IFT-P.024/97, hep-ph/9703346
  - [8] S. Komamiya for the OPAL collaboration, CERN talk on 2/25/97, <http://www1.cern.ch/Opal/plots/komamiya/koma.html>
  - [9] A. Bodek for the CDF collaboration, preprint Fermilab-Conf-96/341-E (1996).
  - [10] P. Lanngacker, Phys. Lett. **B256** 277, (1991)
  - [11] M. Leurer, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 333 (1994)
  - [12] S. Davidson, D. Bailey and B. Campbell, Zeit. fur Phys. **C61**, 613 (1994)
  - [13] M.C. Noecker et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 310 (1988)